



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,623	01/18/2002	Kelvin Chong	2102299-991110	5779
29906	7590	08/12/2005	EXAMINER	
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. 7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251			NAHAR, QAMRUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/054,623	Applicant(s) CHONG ET AL.	
	Examiner Qamrun Nahar	Art Unit 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

20

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 05/09/2005.
2. The objections to the specification are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-11, 13, 15-17 and 19 have been amended.
4. Claims 5 and 23 have been canceled.
5. Claims 1-26 are pending.
6. As previously indicated in the last Office Action (Mailed on 11/18/2004, par. 2), the oath/declaration stand finally objected to.
7. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 19-22 and 24-26 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flores (U.S. 5,630,069).
8. Claims 13-18 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores (U.S. 5,630,069) in view of Ambler (U.S. 6,393,456).

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 19-22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flores (U.S. 5,630,069).

Per Claim 1 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

- **a system for visually building multi-channel applications** (column 3, lines 17-23)
- **a first module adapted to allow a developer to visually design workflow for a multi-channel application** (column 5, lines 35-40 and column 7, lines 10-30)
- **a second module adapted to allow a developer to design views for said multi-channel application** (column 5, lines 41-45)
- **and a third module adapted to allow a developer to integrate data sources within said multi-channel application** (“A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor.” in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel application. In addition, the workflow-enabled application has access to multiple data sources via the channels, i.e. database, which are integrated within the workflow-enabled application.).

Per Claim 2 (Amended):

Art Unit: 2191

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising an interactive development environment for allowing a developer to interact with said first, second and third modules to design said multi-channel application (column 14, lines 33-41; the MVC paradigm allows the interaction.).

Per Claim 3:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said interactive development environment comprises a graphical user interface for allowing a developer to visually interact with said first, second and third module (column 14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 4:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-modal applications (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as multi-modal applications.).

Per Claim 6 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

Art Unit: 2191

- wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-channel applications including at least two channels selected from the group comprising voice channels, web channels, and wireless web channels (column 5, lines 9-12; The workflow-enabled application is accessible via APIs or via messaging, which are interpreted as web channels, and wireless web channels, respectively.).

Per Claim 7 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

- a system for visually building multi-channel applications (column 3, lines 17-23)

- an interactive development environment for visually designing workflow for a multi-channel application, said environment being adapted to allow a developer to independently design said workflow in a plurality of layers, each of said layers corresponding to at least one channel of said multi-channel application (“A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor.” in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel application; also, see column 3, lines 56-67; column 14, lines 33-41; Multiple workflows

Art Unit: 2191

are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 8:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said interactive development environment provides a graphical interface for independently displaying and designing said plurality of layers (column 14, lines 33-41 and column 15, lines 41-55; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 9 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said interface is adapted to independently display a root layer including states common to each of said channels of said multi-channel application, and to allow a developer to visually design said root layer (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 10 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to independently display a voice layer including states common to a voice channel of said multi-channel application, and to allow a developer to visually design said voice layer (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 11 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to independently display a visual layer including states common to a visual channel of said multi-channel application, and to allow a developer to visually design said visual layer (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 12:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to display combinations of said root, voice and visual layers (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 19 (Amended):

The Flores patent discloses:

- **a method of building an application** (column 3, lines 17-23)

- **providing a visual development environment; designing an application workflow within said visual development environment, said application workflow describing certain business logic and comprising a plurality of states and a plurality of transitions, wherein said application workflow describes a multi-channel application; linking said states; and converting said application workflow into an application descriptor for delivering the application over multiple channels** (“A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor.” in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel application; also see column 3, lines 56-67; column 5, lines 35-40; column 7, lines 10-30; and column 14, lines 33-41; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 20:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: designing a presentation of said application within said visual development environment (column 5, lines 41-45).

Per Claim 21:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: internationalizing said presentation of said application within said visual development environment (column 15, lines 41-55).

Per Claim 22:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: integrating data sources into said application by use of said visual development environment (column 5, lines 9-12; the workflow-enabled application has access to multiple data sources via the channels, i.e. database, which are integrated within the workflow-enabled application.).

Per Claim 24:

The Flores patent discloses:

Art Unit: 2191

- wherein said application workflow is designed in a plurality of layers, each layer including states and transitions common to at least one channel of said application (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 25:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: componentizing a plurality of said states and transitions into a reusable sub-model within said visual development environment (column 4, lines 53-57; the records are reusable sub-model).

Per Claim 26:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: packaging said application workflow into a reusable component within said visual development environment (column 4, lines 53-57; the records are reusable component).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2191

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores (U.S. 5,630,069) in view of Ambler (U.S. 6,393,456).

Per Claim 13 (Amended):

Flores teaches a system for visually building multi-channel applications (column 3, lines 17-23), comprising: a graphical user interface adapted to allow a user to visually build a workflow for a multi-channel application (“A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor.” in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel application; also, see column 5, lines 35-40 and column 7, lines 10-30). Flores does not explicitly teach a module for converting said visually built workflow into a markup language. Ambler teaches a module for converting said visually built workflow into a markup language (“The workflow specifications are proposed to be written in extensible Mark-up Language (XML), which provides a robust tool for specifying workflows.” in column 8, lines 43-46; The visually built workflow is represented by workflow specifications, which is converted into XML.).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Flores to include a module for converting said visually built workflow into a markup language using the teaching of Ambler. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use a standard language that allows greater flexibility.

Per Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and Ambler further teaches wherein said markup language comprises an XML-based language (column 8, lines 43-46).

Per Claim 15 (Amended):

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and Flores further teaches wherein said graphical user interface is adapted to allow a user to visually build a single workflow for a multi-channel application capable of operating over a plurality of channels (column 3, lines 56-67; column 14, lines 33-41; and column 15, lines 41-55; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

Per Claim 16 (Amended):

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and Flores further teaches wherein said graphical user interface is adapted to allow a user to visually build a single workflow for a multi-channel application capable of operating in a plurality of modes (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 17 (Amended):

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and Flores further teaches a second graphical user interface adapted to allow a developer to build views of multi-channel application (column 5, lines 41-45; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.); and Ambler further teaches a second module adapted to convert said built views into a markup language (column 12, lines 49-59).

Per Claim 18:

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and Ambler further teaches wherein said markup language comprises an XML-based language (column 8, lines 43-46).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/18/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

a) Applicants submit that the cited Flores reference fails to teach or suggest, for example, "a multi-channel application," as required by claim 1. ... the Flores reference fails to suggest the concept of a multi-channel application, as required by claim 1, since Flores does not suggest the concept of an application that can be accessed via two or more channels. ...

Applicants submit that nothing in this portion of the Flores reference would teach or suggest, for example, "a third module adapted to allow a developer to integrate data sources within said multi-channel application," as required by claim 1.

Examiner's response:

a) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 1. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 1.

Flores teaches a third module adapted to allow a developer to integrate data sources within said multi-channel application ("A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor." in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel application. In addition, the workflow-enabled application has access to multiple data sources via the channels, i.e. database, which are integrated within the workflow-enabled application.).

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 1.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

b) Dependent claim 2 requires "an interactive development environment for allowing a developer to interact with said first, second and third modules to design said multi-channel application," ... Applicant submit that nothing in the Flores reference suggests that a conventional Model-View-Controller (MVC) paradigm, such as that shown in Figure 26 of the present application, should be changed to allow a developer to interact with said first, second, third modules.

Examiner's response:

b) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 2. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 2. Flores teaches an interactive development environment for allowing a developer to interact with said first, second and third modules to design said multi-channel application (column 14, lines 33-41; the MVC paradigm allows the interaction.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 2.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

c) Dependent claim 4 requires the "system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-modal applications." ... As such, the Flores reference fails to teach the concept of a multi-mode application.

Examiner's response:

c) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 4. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 4. Flores teaches wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-modal applications (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as multi-modal applications.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 4.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

Art Unit: 2191

d) The Office Action also rejects claim 6 ... Dependent claim 6 requires that the “system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-channel application including at least two channels selected from the group ... Applicants submit that the Flores reference fails to teach the above recitations of claim 6.

Examiner's response:

d) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 6. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 6. Flores teaches wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-channel applications including at least two channels selected from the group comprising voice channels, web channels, and wireless web channels (column 5, lines 9-12; The workflow-enabled application is accessible via APIs or via messaging, which are interpreted as web channels, and wireless web channels, respectively.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 6.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

e) Independent claim 7 requires “an interactive development environment for visually designing workflow for a multi-channel application.” ...

In addition, Applications submit that the Flores reference also fails to teach an “environment being adapted to allow a developer ... in a plurality of layers, each of said layers corresponding to at least one channel of said multi-channel application” as required by claim 7. ... The sections of the Flores reference fail to teach that layers correspond to at least one channel.

Examiner's response:

e) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 7. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 7.

Flores teaches an interactive development environment for visually designing workflow for a multi-channel application, said environment being adapted to allow a developer to independently design said workflow in a plurality of layers, each of said layers corresponding to at least one channel of said multi-channel application ("A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor." in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel application; also, see column 3, lines 56-67; column 14, lines 33-41; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 7.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

f) For example, dependent claim 8 was also rejected based on column ... claim 8 requires "said interactive development environment provides a ... for independently displaying and designing said plurality of layers." ... since the Flores reference fails to teach that a graphical

Art Unit: 2191

interface for “independently displaying and designing said plurality of layers”, as required by claim 8.

Examiner's response:

f) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 8. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 8. Flores teaches wherein said interactive development environment provides a graphical interface for independently displaying and designing said plurality of layers (column 14, lines 33-41 and column 15, lines 41-55; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 8.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

g) The Office Action also rejects dependent claims 9, 10, 11, 12 based on column ... Applicants submit that the cited section of Flores fails to teach at least the above-underlined recitations of claims 9-12.

Examiner's response:

g) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 9-12. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claims 9-12.

Flores teaches wherein said interface is adapted to independently display a root layer including states common to each of said channels of said multi-channel application, and to allow a developer to visually design said root layer (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.) as recited in claim 9; further teaches wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to independently display a voice layer including states common to a voice channel of said multi-channel application, and to allow a developer to visually design said voice layer (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.) as recited in claim 10; further teaches wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to independently display a visual layer including states common to a visual channel of said multi-channel application, and to allow a developer to visually design said visual layer (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.) as recited in claim 11; and further teaches wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to display combinations of said root, voice and visual layers (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.) as recited in claim 12.

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claims 9-12.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

h) Applicants amend independent claim 19 to include ... the cited Flores reference fails to teach, for example, that the “application workflow describes a multi-channel application” or

“converting said application workflow into an application descriptor for delivering the application over multiple channels,” as required by claim 19 ... Applicants submit that nothing in this portion of the Flores reference would teach or suggest, for example, that the “application workflow describes a multi-channel application,” or the step of “converting said application workflow into an application descriptor for delivering the applications over multiple channels,” as required by claim 19.

Examiner's response:

h) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 19. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 19.

Flores teaches providing a visual development environment; designing an application workflow within said visual development environment, said application workflow describing certain business logic and comprising a plurality of states and a plurality of transitions, wherein said application workflow describes a multi-channel application; linking said states; and converting said application workflow into an application descriptor for delivering the application over multiple channels (“A workflow-enabled application interfaces to the server via *the transactions database of the workflow server* or via *APIs*, or via *messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs)* or through the use of an STF processor.” in column 5, lines 9-12; emphasis added, where the workflow-enabled application is accessible via the transactions database of the workflow server or via APIs, or via messaging, database, or interprocess communications (IPCs). Therefore, the workflow-enabled application is a multi-channel

Art Unit: 2191

application; also see column 3, lines 56-67; column 5, lines 35-40; column 7, lines 10-30; and column 14, lines 33-41; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.).

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 19.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

i) For example, the Office Action also rejects claim 21 based upon ... Dependent claim 21 requires “internationalizing said presentation of said application within said visual development environment” ... Applicants submit that the Flores reference fails to teach at least the above-underlined recitations of claim 21.

Examiner’s response:

i) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant’s assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 21. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 21. Flores teaches internationalizing said presentation of said application within said visual development environment (column 15, lines 41-55). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 21.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

j) Dependent claim 22 requires “integrating data sources into said application by use of said visual development environment.” Dependent claim 23 requires “application workflow

Art Unit: 2191

describes a multi-channel application.” ... Applicants submit that the Flores reference fails to teach at least the above-underlined recitations of claims 22 and 23.

Examiner’s response:

j) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant’s assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 22. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 22. Flores teaches further comprising the step of: integrating data sources into said application by use of said visual development environment (column 5, lines 9-12; the workflow-enabled application has access to multiple data sources via the channels, i.e. database, which are integrated within the workflow-enabled application.).

In addition, claim 23 has been canceled. Therefore, applicant’s arguments regarding claim 23 is moot.

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 22.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

k) In addition, dependent claim 24 requires “application workflow is designed in a plurality of layers, each layer ... common to at least one channel of said application.” For at least the reasons noted with respect to claim 7, Applicants submit that the Flores reference fails to teach the above recitations of claim 24. In addition, Applicants submit ... fail to teach “each layer including states ... of said application,” as required by claim 24.

Examiner’s response:

Art Unit: 2191

k) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 24. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 24. Flores teaches wherein said application workflow is designed in a plurality of layers, each layer including states and transitions common to at least one channel of said application (column 3, lines 56-67; Multiple workflows are interpreted as plurality of layers, which correspond to channels of the multi-channel application.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claim 24.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

l) Dependent claim 25 requires "componentizing a ..." Dependent claim 26 requires "packaging said application workflow into a reusable component ..." The Office Action rejects claims 25 and 26 ... Applicants submit that the Flores reference fails to teach at least the above-underlined recitations of claims 25 and 26.

Examiner's response:

l) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Flores fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 25 and 26. Flores clearly shows each and every limitation in claims 25 and 26. Flores teaches further comprising the step of: componentizing a plurality of said states and transitions into a reusable sub-model within said visual development environment (column 4, lines 53-57; the records are reusable sub-model) as recited in claim 25; further teaches further comprising the step of: packaging said application workflow into a reusable component within said visual development environment (column 4, lines 53-57; the records are

Art Unit: 2191

reusable component) as recited in claim 26. In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for rejection to claims 25 and 26.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

m) The Office Action rejects claims 13-18 ... For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest “a workflow for a multi-channel application,” as required by claim 13.

Examiner's response:

m) The Examiner has already addressed the applicant's arguments regarding a workflow for a multi-channel application in the Examiner's Response (a) above.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

n) Applicants respectfully submit that although the Ambler reference disclose that the general concept of a markup language is known, nothing in the Amber reference would suggest “converting said visually built workflow into a markup language,” as required by claim 13.

Examiner's response:

n) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that the combination of Flores and Ambler fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claim 13. The combination of Flores and Ambler clearly shows each and every limitation in claim 13. Ambler teaches a module for converting said visually built workflow into a markup language (“The workflow specifications

Art Unit: 2191

are proposed to be written in extensible Mark-up Language (XML), which provides a robust tool for specifying workflows.” in column 8, lines 43-46; The visually built workflow is represented by workflow specifications, which is converted into XML.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 12 for rejection to claim 13.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

o) For example, the Office Action rejects claim 15 based upon ... Dependent claim 15 requires “said graphical user interface is adapted to allow a user to visually build a ... for a multi-channel application capable of operating over a plurality of channels.” Dependent claim 17 requires “a second ... a developer to build views of a multi-channel application.” Applicant submits that dependent claims 15 and 17 are separately patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Examiner’s response:

o) The Examiner has already addressed the applicant’s arguments regarding claim 1 in the Examiner’s Response (a) above.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2191

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2191

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QN

July 28, 2005

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Anthony Nguyen-Ba".

ANTHONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER